

Appl. No. 10/517,222
Amdt. Dated May 26, 2009
Reply to Office Action of January 23, 2009

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

By this amendment, Applicant has canceled claim 31 in light of the Examiner's indication that claim 31 has been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging receipt of Applicant's certified priority document. In regard to the objection to the drawings raised by the Examiner, Applicant has modified Figures 17, 18, and 19A-19B to incorporate the "Prior Art" designation requested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the drawings.

In regard to the claim objections set forth by the Examiner, Applicants have modified the claims to overcome the Examiner's objections to the claims. Additionally, Applicant has modified the claims to overcome the Examiners rejections set forth under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as now modified fully comport with all of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the claim rejections set forth under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the prior art rejections set forth by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. sections 102 and 103. Applicant respectfully submits that the prior art references of record, whether considered alone, or in combination, fail to either teach or suggest Applicant's presently claimed invention.

While Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter with respect to claims 13, 17, 21 and 25, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims now stand in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 10/517,222
Amdt. Dated May 26, 2009
Reply to Office Action of January 23, 2009

More specifically, by this Amendment, Applicant has modified the independent claims to specifically recite the significant differences between the present invention in the prior art. For example, independent claim 1 has been modified to specifically require that: signal electric-charge obtained by a photo-conductive unit at a same row position transferred by the corresponding column electric-charge transfer units for a electric-charge detection unit reaches said corresponding electric-charge detection unit at a different vertical transfer time.

The requirement that signal electric charge obtained by a photoconductive unit of the same row position that is transferred by the corresponding column electric-charge transfer units for a single electric-charge detection unit reaches the corresponding electric-charge detection unit at a different vertical transfer time distinguishes over the references cited by the Examiner. In contrast with the present invention, the cited references do not indicate or suggest a structure or method wherein charge is transferred to the electric charge detection unit at a different vertical transfer time as now specified.

Additionally, independent claim 2 has been modified to specifically require that: a number of stages of electric-charge transfer is different with respect to each of said column electric-charge transfer units associated with a corresponding electric-charge detection unit. In contrast with the invention as specified in modified claim 2, the cited references only indicate that the number of stages of electric-charge transfer is the same for each of the column electric charge transfer units that are associated with a corresponding electric-charge detection unit.

Appl. No. 10/517,222
Amdt. Dated May 26, 2009
Reply to Office Action of January 23, 2009

Accordingly, in light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims now standing condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees due or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3891.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 5/26/09

(Reg. #37,607)

Robert J. Depke

ROCKEY DEPKE & LYONS, LLC.

233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 5450

Chicago, Illinois 60606

Tel: (312) 277-2006

Attorney for Applicants

Appl. No. 10/517,222
Amdt. Dated May 26, 2009
Reply to Office Action of January 23, 2009

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

Applicants have amended Figs. 17, 18 and 19A-19B to include the legend
"PRIOR ART", as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants submit that no new matter
has been added.